# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCY United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,814	01/30/2004	Fanny Astruc	016800-667	6599
	7590 06/07/200 INGERSOLL & ROOI	EXAMINER		
POST OFFICE BOX 1404			HUYNH, CARLIC K	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/767,814	ASTRUC ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Carlic K. Huynh	1617				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ This	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> are subject to restriction and/or expressions.	wn from consideration.	·				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicated any not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 10.	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate				

Art Unit: 1617

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

#### Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-24, drawn to a stable, recrystallization-resistant invert emulsion comprising DHEA or a chemical or biological derivative of DHEA, and further comprising a glycolic or hydroglycolic dispersed hydrophilic phase, a lipophilic continuous phase and an emulsifier, classified in class 424, subclass 401.
- II. Claim 25, drawn to a regimen for preventing or treating chronological or actinic skin aging comprising administering a stable, recrystallization-resistant invert emulsion comprising DHEA or a chemical or biological derivative of DHEA, and further comprising a glycolic or hydroglycolic dispersed hydrophilic phase, a lipophilic continuous phase and an emulsifier, classified in class 424, subclass 401.
- III. Claim 26, drawn to a regimen for treating and/or protecting the skin, the mucous membranes or the keratinous fibers comprising administering a stable, recrystallization-resistant invert emulsion comprising DHEA or a chemical or biological derivative of DHEA, and further comprising a glycolic or hydroglycolic dispersed hydrophilic phase, a lipophilic continuous phase and an emulsifier, classified in class 424, subclass 401.
- IV. Claim 27, drawn to regimen for preventing or treating canities comprising
   administering a stable, recrystallization-resistant invert emulsion comprising
   DHEA or a chemical or biological derivative of DHEA, and further comprising a

glycolic or hydroglycolic dispersed hydrophilic phase, a lipophilic continuous phase and an emulsifier, classified in class 424, subclass 401.

- V. Claim 28, drawn to a regimen for attenuating pigmented skin spots comprising administering a stable, recrystallization-resistant invert emulsion comprising DHEA or a chemical or biological derivative of DHEA, and further comprising a glycolic or hydroglycolic dispersed hydrophilic phase, a lipophilic continuous phase and an emulsifier, classified in class 424, subclass 401.
- VI. Claim 29, drawn to a regimen for preventing or treating atrophy of the skin or mucous membranes comprising administering a stable, recrystallization-resistant invert emulsion comprising DHEA or a chemical or biological derivative of DHEA, and further comprising a glycolic or hydroglycolic dispersed hydrophilic phase, a lipophilic continuous phase and an emulsifier, classified in class 424, subclass 401.
- VII. Claim 30, drawn to a regimen for preventing or treating vulvar or vaginal atrophy comprising administering a stable, recrystallization-resistant invert emulsion comprising DHEA or a chemical or biological derivative of DHEA, and further comprising a glycolic or hydroglycolic dispersed hydrophilic phase, a lipophilic continuous phase and an emulsifier, classified in class 424, subclass 401.
- 2. Inventions I and [II-VII] are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product

Art Unit: 1617

as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, (1) other stable, recrystallization-resistant invert emulsions can be used with the regimen for preventing or treating various skin conditions or conditions affecting the mucous membranes, e.g. antibiotics, anti-cancer agents, and high blood pressure medications; and (2) the stable, recrystallization-resistant invert emulsion can be used in other regimen of treatment.

Page 4

3. Inventions [II-VII] are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions [II-VII] have different designs and modes of operation because invention II is a treatment for chronological or actinic skin aging, invention III is a regimen for protecting the skin, the mucous membranes, or the keratinous fibers, invention IV is a treatment for canities, invention V is a regimen for attenuating pigmented skin spots, invention VI is a treatment for atrophy of the skin or mucous membranes, and invention VII is a treatment for vulvar or vaginal atrophy, were each of inventions [II-VII] is a distinct disease process.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above <u>and</u> there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

(a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;

Art Unit: 1617

(b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;

Page 5

- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include

(i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the

inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 4. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:
- (1) a single disclosed species of a DHEA, a chemical precursor of DHEA of formula (1), or a biological precursor of DHEA of formula (1);
  - (2) a single disclosed species of a dispersed hydrophilic phase; and
  - (3) a single disclosed species of an emulsifier.

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

If Group I-VII is elected, the applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect: (1) a single disclosed species of a DHEA, a chemical precursor of DHEA of formula (1), or a biological precursor of DHEA of formula (1); (2) a single disclosed species of a dispersed hydrophilic phase; and (3) a single disclosed species of an emulsifier for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-3, 6-22, 25-30 are generic.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another

species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

A telephone call to the attorney is not required where: 1) the restriction requirement is complex, 2) the application is being prosecuted pro se, or 3) the examiner knows from past experience that a telephone election will not be made (MPEP § 812.01). Therefore, since this restriction requirement is considered complex, a call to the attorney for telephone election was not made.

# Notice of Possible Rejoinder

5. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102,

Art Unit: 1617

103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Page 9

## Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlic K. Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-5574. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/767,814 Page 10

Art Unit: 1617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ckh

SHENGJUN WANG